



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,078	07/24/2000	Goran Hageltorn	98764-U.S.	5385

23553 7590 05/07/2003

MARKS & CLERK
P.O. BOX 957
STATION B
OTTAWA, ON K1P 5S7
CANADA

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/624,078

Applicant(s)

HAGELTORN ET AL. 

Examiner

Brandon J Miller

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boch in view of Wildey.

Regarding claims 1 Boch teaches improving spectrum deployment in a cellular wireless communications system having multiple adjacent cells, which provide service to a geographic area (see col. 4, lines 58-67). Boch teaches each cell having a base station with a sectored antenna for bi-directional communication with customer premise equipment located in sectors of a cell, the base stations in adjacent cells being arranged in a grid configuration (see col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 4, lines 7-20 & 59-65). Boch teaches selecting at least one frequency set for upstream and downstream communication between the base stations and customer premise equipment (see col. 4, lines 7-20). Boch teaches employing polarization diversity between communications in adjacent sectors (see col. 3, lines 39-45). Boch does not teach rotating the sectors in each cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle. Wildey teaches rotating the sectors in a cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Boch adapt to include rotating the

Art Unit: 2683

sectors in each cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle because this would allow for minimized interference at a point which lies in line with and beyond adjacent sites in a network.

Regarding claim 2 Boch teaches a cell that is divided into four sectors and each base station sector antenna covers a nominal sector of 90 degrees (see col. 3, lines 56-67 and col. 4, lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 3 Widley teaches a configurable angle that is in the range ± 17.5 degrees to ± 27.5 degrees (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52).

Regarding claim 4 Boch and Widley teaches a device as recited in claim 3 except for an angle that is ± 22.5 degrees. Widly teaches a configurable angle that is in the range ± 17.5 degrees to ± 27.5 degrees (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52). Even though Boch and Widley do not teach a configurable angle that is specifically ± 27.5 degrees it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to rotate the angle to a desired specification because this would allow for the possibility of improved signal coverage of a plurality of reception areas in terms of the degree of interference.

Regarding claim 5 Boch teaches four cells arranged in a two by two grid configuration (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52). Widly teaches a configurable angle that is in the range ± 17.5 degrees to ± 27.5 degrees (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52).

Regarding claim 6 Boch and Widly teach a device as recited in claim 1 except for nine cells arranged in a three-grid configuration. Boch teaches four cells arranged in a two by two grid configuration (see pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52 and pg. 5, lines 58-62). Even though Boch and Widley do not specifically teach nine cells arranged in a three grid configuration either

Art Unit: 2683

reference would work equally as well regardless of the number of cells arranged in the grid configuration and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust cell arrangement to a desired specification because this would allow for a projected coverage plan that can accommodate the requirement for spectral efficiency within a given coverage area.

Regarding claim 12 Boch teaches a system for improving frequency spectrum deployment in a cellular wireless communications system having multiple adjacent cells to provide communications service to a geographic area (see col. 4, lines 58-67). Boch teaches each cell having a base station with a sectored antenna for bi-directional communication with customer premise equipment located in sectors of a cell, the base stations in adjacent cells being arranged in a grid configuration (see col. 3, lines 60-67 and col. 4, lines 7-20 & 59-65). Boch teaches a directional antenna at each CPE for receiving downstream communication from a base station and transmitting upstream communication to a base station to select at least one frequency set for upstream and downstream communication between the base stations and customer premise equipment (see col. 4, lines 7-20 & 39-57). Boch teaches employing polarization diversity between communications in adjacent sectors (see col. 3, lines 39-45). Boch does not teach configuring the sectors in each cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle. Wildey teaches configuring the sectors in a cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle (see abstract and pg. 6, lines 23-28 & 46-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Boch adapt to include rotating the sectors in each cell such that dividing lines between sectors are offset relative to the grid configuration by a configurable angle because this would

Art Unit: 2683

allow for minimized interference at a point which lies in line with and beyond adjacent sites in a network.

Regarding claim 13 Boch and Widley teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 14 Boch and Widley teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 15 Boch and Widley teach a device as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boch in view of Wildey and Florea.

Regarding claim 7 Boch and Widley teach a device as recited in claim 6 except for one or more interference slivers are identified in which a carrier to interference ratio (C/I) required to satisfy a service criteria is not achieved. Florea teaches one or more interference slivers are identified in which a required carrier to interference ratio (C/I) is not achieved (see col. 4, lines 5-12, col. 7, lines 32-40 and col. 13, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Boch and Widley adapt to include one or more interference slivers are identified in which a carrier to interference ratio (C/I) required to satisfy a service criteria is not achieved because this would allow for determination of improved signal coverage of a plurality of reception areas in terms of the degree of interference.

Regarding claim 8 Florea teaches a separate frequency set that is used to provide service to one or more slivers (see col. 7, lines 45-50 & 59-62).

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 9 Florea teaches providing inadequate coverage to one or more interference slivers (see col. 13, lines 10-12).

Regarding claim 10 Boch and Widley teach a device as recited in claim 6 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 11 Widley teaches multiple clusters of four by four grid configurations (see pg. 8, lines 7-11 and Fig. 5).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dipiazza U.S. Patent Application 6,141,557 discloses LMDS system having cell-site diversity and adaptability.

Bossard U.S. Patent Application 5,668,610 discloses a LMDS transmitter array with polarization-diversity sub-cells.

Dixon U.S. Patent Application 6,275,704 discloses a multiple access communication system with polarized antennas.

Roark U.S. Patent Application 6,404,751 discloses a common control channel dynamic frequency assignment method and protocol.

Boch U.S. Patent Application 6,205,337 discloses use of sectorized polarization diversity as a means of increasing capacity in cellular wireless systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J Miller whose telephone number is 703-305-4222. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2683

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

April 27, 2003



**WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**